



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

suffers elision in Lucil. 577 (Marx). In § 1078, an example of semi-hiatu is needed. *Periclō* (§ 1087) is the original form, not a syncopated form of *periculō*; a valid example is *repostum*, Aen. 1. 26. The real rule for iambic shortening (§ 1089) is better stated thus: "A long syllable immediately before or after the metrical stress may be treated as short if the preceding syllable, whether in the same or in another word, is short". Such examples as *cōmpedēs cōgam*, Plaut. Persa 782, and *pēssum(ē) ōrnatū*, Aul. 721, violate Professor Burton's formulation of the rule. § 1095 should admit the main caesura in the third foot.

In taking exception to so many points, the reviewer has not forgotten that criticism is largely subjective, and naturally so; and that another might hardly agree with him in the majority of the points—certainly not in all. Yet to make sure that he was not carping unjustly at a book when all others were as bad or worse, he has attentively read over great sections of the other standard school and college grammars, and has found that while they were not perfect—in his opinion—they offered fewer points to which he would raise objection than does the book under discussion. He therefore feels that Professor Burton's Grammar cannot be considered as making advances upon those already in the field, and that it presents errors and imperfections that will prevent its adoption over others. At the same time he believes that these flaws are removable, and that a careful working over both from the standpoint of facts and of presentation would render this book, in a second edition, the equal of any other current grammar with the same aims, and entirely acceptable to any teacher of Latin.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

HEAD OF A GREEK ATHLETE¹

In his Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture, Professor Furtwängler called attention to a fine marble head of a Greek athlete in the possession of Lord Leconfield, at Petworth, which up to that time had been little appreciated or even known among students of Greek art. He adjudged it correctly as a copy of a lost original of the fifth century B. C., and even named the sculptor to whom he thought the original could be ascribed, a point which we may pass over for the moment. That the original was an important statue was to be inferred not only from the merits of the Petworth head, but from the fact that he could cite three other copies of it, one in the Riccardi Palace in Florence, another—a fragment of one side only—in the Museum at Trèves, and a third, formerly in the possession of a Roman dealer. To these four must now be added a fifth, a life-size head which was purchased by the Museum last summer, out of funds

from the Hewitt bequest, and is now on exhibition in the Room of Recent Accessions.

Its resemblance to the Petworth head is so close as to leave no doubt of a common derivation, but it is distinctly the more beautiful of the two, and in the subtlety of the modeling is probably a more faithful reproduction of the original, full of the spirit of fifth-century work'. . . .

Aside from the beauty of the features, the head has a certain romantic quality which is unusual in Greek art, especially of this period, and which doubtless adds to its attractiveness from a modern point of view, though it is largely accidental and can be explained on other grounds. The head is evidently from a statue representing a young athlete, who is marked as a victor by the fillet which he wears, the badge of victory in an athletic contest. Some further idea of the figure may be gained from the fact that the head was not carried erect, but, as the lines of the neck show, bent considerably to the right. Also, there is on the top of the head a small square projection—repeated on three of the other copies—which from analogy is to be interpreted as a support for an arm, indicating that he stood with one arm resting on his head, a pose not uncommon in statues of the fifth century. He was, therefore, a victorious athlete resting after a competition, and the impression of melancholy made by the face—heightened now by the discoloration of the marble, which intensifies the shadows in and about the eyes—was intended by the sculptor only as a suggestion of physical fatigue.

The main thing that the sculptor sought to express was his ideal of the beauty of young manhood in its perfect development in which the physical and intellectual elements were harmoniously blended, as far removed as possible from brutality on the one hand, or sentimentality on the other; and in the success with which that ideal has been achieved, our head must be regarded as an example of a very high order. The broad, low forehead, with its almost imperceptible swelling above the brows, the low curve of the latter, and the sharp angle at which the eyes are set below them, the slight but intentional difference in the size of the eyes, the delicate oval of the cheeks tapering to the small chin, and the finely modeled nose and mouth, all play their part in making up the beauty of the face, the simple lines of which are accentuated by the thick, almost turbulent masses of curly hair above it.

Some of these characteristics are so individual, and make the head so different from the types of the better-known sculptors of the fifth century, as to lead us to seek its creator among the artists of the period who are less famous to-day. Among these is

¹ Reprinted from Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, for March, 1912.

¹ The best illustrations of the Petworth head are the atlas of the German edition of Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke*, pl. XVI. Two views of it are also given in the English edition, figs. 64, 65, where it is discussed on pp. 161 ff.

Kresilas, to whom Furtwängler attributed the original of the Petworth head, together with other works of a similar character.

All we know definitely about the life of this sculptor is that he was born at Kydonia, in Crete, and that he was active in the second half of the fifth century B. C. Inscriptions from three pedestals, bearing his signature, have been found on the Akropolis of Athens, which make it probable that he worked in that city during part of his career, more especially because one of the pedestals had belonged to a statue of Perikles. That statue, by the way, was probably the one which called forth the admiration of Pliny, who says that Kresilas made "an Olympian Perikles, worthy of the epithet, and it is wonderful how in this art he made noble men more noble",—a remark which might well be applied to our head. A fourth inscription with his signature has been found in Argolis, and as this is written in Argive characters, Furtwängler regarded it as proof that he worked also in that district, though one such inscription could hardly be regarded as establishing the fact, as it might have been made by a local stone-cutter for a statue sent from another place. However this may be, several other statues by him are mentioned by ancient writers, chiefly Pliny, the best known being his Amazon at Ephesos, which was regarded as ranking next to those by Pheidias and Polykleitos among the various figures of Amazons erected there. This fact alone would establish him as one of the great sculptors of his time, and it is unfortunate that we have so little knowledge of his style and characteristics as an artist. Furtwängler assumed that the well-known busts of Perikles in the British Museum and the Vatican were copied from the statue referred to above, and upon them based his attribution of other heads and statues which he classed as works by or derived from Kresilas. Among these our head may properly be classed. The assumption, however, remains a conjecture which though plausible is not yet established. E. R.

REVIEWS

Latin Prose Composition. Part I: Based on Caesar.

By William Gardner Hale, with the Collaboration of Charles Henry Beeson and Wilbert Lester Carr. Chicago: Atkinson, Mentzer and Grover (1910). Pp. XII + 137. 50 cents.

The primary principle followed by Professor Hale and his Associates in making this book seems to have been to derive directly from the Latin which the student is reading the Latin which he is to write. Here is a confession of faith as set forth in the preface:

Reading and writing should go hand in hand. The incidents of any given exercise, and the new words and new constructions demanded by it, should be

selected from the reading presumably done by the student since he wrote the last exercise preceding The incidents should be true to the facts and the spirit of the original—in this case, the first four books of the Gallic War. A composition book should be a companion to the author—an aid, and not a source of confusion.

This book, then, is constructed in conformity with these precepts: each lesson begins with a list of constructions culled from the Caesar recently read; references for these are given to several commonly-used Grammars, together with brief explanatory comments, which are often marvels of conciseness and lucidity; then follows a reasonable number of sentences to be turned into Latin, the subject-matter and vocabulary of which are also drawn from the text just studied, and which, while connected in thought, are numbered for class-room purposes. Footnotes are attached to these, which betray the laudable intent of trying to make the student think. The lessons are thirty-five in number, one for each week of the school-year, and each contains only so much material as may be mastered in the allotted time. A supplementary series of lessons, likewise thirty-five in number, is added, to be used as the teacher may find advisable. The division of the four books of Caesar into weekly portions seems to have been made with exceeding care and wisdom; the war with Ariovistus (I. 30-54) is put at the end of the fourth book; except for this change the student reads his author consecutively. At the end of the book is a vocabulary, and an appendix containing two tables, one of the case uses and another of the subjunctives.

On the first page which is designed for the pupil, Professor Hale, in a brief introduction entitled Why We Write Latin, declares that the main purpose of studying composition is to make the reading of Latin easier and surer. To such a dictum no one will take exception; what is the best method, however, of attaining the desired end? On this point opinions naturally enough differ. It is the belief of the reviewer that composition can most effectively aid Latin reading by collecting the *disiecta membra* surviving from the initial year, and building upon this as a framework a fairly complete synopsis of Latin grammar. Professor Hale's book, by its strict adherence to the text read in class, necessarily presents a view, not of Latin syntax in general, but of that of the first four books of the *Bellum Gallicum*. Even if Caesar were the only Latin ever to be read by the student, it is doubtful whether this method would be the wisest, most logical preparation: on four days of the week the class is busied with the interpretation of the author, and the principles which arise to his consciousness are likely to appear more or less isolated and unrelated; the composition period is the hour of synthesis, and the grammar then studied should be that of the language as a whole, with